•	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/787,312	GOROVOY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Dean O. Takaoka	2817
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) <u>Dean O. Takaoka</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Isis E Caulder</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 28 September 2007	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103		
Claims discussed: 1,12		
Prior art documents discussed: Hettlage, Mayer and Spinner		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
han Jalak		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/	Applicant's Representative Si	gnature - if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was the position of the Examiner that the amendments and arguments contained in Applicant's amendment dated August 23, 2007 were not persuasive and did not patentably distinguish over the prior art of record. It was agreed to further define independent claims 1 and 12 to further distinguish Applicant's features over the applied prior art of record. It was agreed changes would be made by Examiner's amendment in order to place the claims in condition for allowance.